

# **AGENDA**

## **SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE**

November 30, 2004

7:00 - 10:00 p.m.

Pennino Building, Group Decision Support Center

| <u>Time</u> | <u>Item</u>                                    | <u>Responsible Person</u> |
|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| 7:03        | Opening/Welcome                                | Chairman                  |
| 7:05        | Approval of Minutes of November 15             | Members                   |
| 7:10        | Discussion of Operations Issues                | Members and J.R. Holt     |
| 8:30        | Break  |                           |
| 8:40        | Discussion of Operations Issues<br>Continues   | Members and J.R. Holt     |
| 9:40        | Distribute Technical Changes to<br>Chapter 109 | Staff                     |
| 9:45        | Summary of Meeting                             | Chairman and/Facilitator  |
| 10:00       | Adjourn  | Chairman                  |

**Next meeting – December 14, 2004 7:00 p.m. in the Government Center,  
Conference Room 232 or possibly GDSC**

## **OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

### **For November 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Solid Waste Management Task Force**

#### **INSPECTIONS AND PERMITTING OF VEHICLES**

1. County requires that all solid waste vehicles be permitted on an annual basis. In recent years, County staff have agreed to provide onsite inspections at the haulers' facilities and inspections include vehicle safety items, registrations, weight, stickers, etc.
2. What are the issues regarding solid waste VEHICLE PERMITTING?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation about VEHICLE PERMITTING? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

#### **ASSURANCE BOND POLICY**

1. County requires an assurance bond of \$10,000 per truck collecting solid waste in Fairfax County as collateral for payment of all disposal fees to the County and to assure that service delivery will not be interrupted in the case of a private hauler going out of business. The cost of posting the bond to the hauler is variable depending on credit worthiness and experience.
2. What are the issues regarding ASSURANCE BONDS?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation about ASSURANCE BONDS? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

#### **UNIFIED RECYCLING ACTIVITIES**

1. The Solid Waste Management Plan adopted by the BOS specifies that additional materials (mixed paper, plastic bottles, cardboard) be collected curbside. Haulers will be required to collect these materials.
2. How should this change to recycling be implemented – all at once, or one material at a time?
3. What are the issues with respect to educating residents as to the new recycling requirements?
4. Should the County take the lead in developing recycling outreach materials or should the individual haulers? Why or why not?

#### **ENFORCEMENT ISSUES**

1. Supervisor Kauffman also asked that Chapter 109 be more rigorously enforced. The County currently is responsible for Chapter 109 of the Code. Recommendations of this Task Force will probably require changes to the Code.
2. What would be the consequences of more rigorous enforcement of Chapter 109?
3. What areas of the code should be the focus of more rigorous enforcement?
4. What resources would be necessary to enforce the Code more rigorously?

**5. What strategies of ENFORCEMENT should this Task Force recommend?**

## **CONSEQUENCE OF THE COUNTY GETTING OUT OF DIRECT WASTE REMOVAL**

- 1. The County currently collects waste and special collections from about 43,000 homes in sanitary districts. This is about 15% of the homes in the County and of these approximately 1,600 are served by contract. The County provides vacuum leaf collection for approximately 22,000 customers. Supervisor Kaufmann asked that the consequences of the County getting out of direct waste collections be evaluated.**
- 2. What are the POSITIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?**
- 3. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?**
- 4. What are the POSITIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?**
- 5. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?**
- 6. What are the POSITIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?**
- 7. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?**
- 8. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation on whether the County should continue to collect solid waste, special collections and vacuum leaves? Why or why not?**
- 9. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?**

## **PROCUREMENT OF COUNTY CONTRACTS**

- 1. The County's procurement system is established under authority from the State. State and County procurement rules and procedures allow for additional service areas to be added to a contract by mutual agreement without recompeting. It is the County's policy to use the existing contract instead of developing a new contract for each new sanitary district that is added. This process saves on solicitation costs (estimated to exceed \$30,000 per solicitation in terms of staff and contractors' time) and additional work throughout the County's procurement system. Procurement law does not constrain the number of awards that can be won by a single company.**
- 2. What are the issues about the County's PROCUREMENT PROCESS regarding solid waste services?**
- 3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation concerning the County PROCUREMENT PROCESS? Why or why not?**
- 4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?**